IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

* * * * *

C.W.P NO.17671 OF 2006

Date of decision : November 14, 2006

* * * * *

Prabhjot Kaur .....Petitioner

Vs.

Baba Farid University of Health Sciences & others ...Respondents

* * * * *

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINEY MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S BHALLA

Present: Mr. D.P.S Randhawa, Advocate for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Parampreet Brar, Advocate for Mr. T.S Dhindsa, Advocate for respondents no. 1 & 2.
Mr. Sukhdip Singh Brar, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

* * * * *

Viney Mittal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court claiming that although she is eligible, having passed her +1 and +2 Examination from Punjab School Education Board but she is being denied admission to B.Sc Nursing Course absolutely without any justification. It has also been alleged by the petitioner that on an earlier occasion at the time of first counselling at Government Medical College, Patiala, the petitioner was offered a seat in the Course of Physiotherapy but since she wanted admission in the Nursing course therefore, she did not accept the aforesaid offer. However, later on at the time of third counselling, she had been denied admission as per her rank and merit position.

Sh. Parampreet Brar, Advocate has produced before us the original record and the application form submitted by the petitioner. On the

basis of the aforesaid record, learned counsel has pointed out that although the petitioner had secured the rank as described by her in the petition and her merit position described in the petition is also correct but the allegation that she had ever been offered any seat in the Phsiotheraphy course in the first counselling held at Government Medical College, Patiala is absolutely incorrect inasmuch as at the time of scrutiny, it was realized by the University authorities that the application form submitted by the petitioner was incomplete inasmuch as the certificate of her passing +1 examination was not so attached. The petitioner wanted to attach the aforesaid certificate only at the time of third counselling, which was not permissible as per the stipulation contained in the prospectus. It has also been maintained that the application form is incomplete, therefore her request for participation in the third counselling cannot be accepted.

Keeping in view the stand taken by the learned counsel for the respondent-University on the basis of the original record, we do not find any merit in the present petition.

Dismissed.

(VINEY MITTAL)
JUDGE

November 14, 2006
ritu

(H.S BHALLA)
JUDGE